UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/994,600	11/19/2001	Douglas H. Anderson	CYPR-CD01174M	8949

7590   05/04/2005

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Thrid Floor
Two North Market Street
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER
STORK, KYLE R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 January 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This final office action is in response to the amendment filed 24 January 2005.

2.   Claims 1-26 are pending. Claims 1, 11, 17, and 24 are independent. The rejection of claims 25 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 112 has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment. The rejection of claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. 103 under Brooke et al. (US 6748569, hereafter Brooke) in view of Bauwens et al. (US 6704893, hereafter Bauwens), Gristede et al. (Us 6175949, hereafter Gristede), Object Domain R3, and XMI, has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-7, 10-23, and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brooke and Bauwens in further view of Dole (US 6634008, filed 2000).

As per independent claim 1, Brooke discloses the method for generating a project datasheet in an integrated design environment comprising:

- Accessing project data from an XML database structure (column 6, lines 18-20)

- Accessing an XSL stylesheet (column 6, lines 23-26)

- Processing the project data according to the XSL stylesheet to automatically

  produce a project datasheet file (column 6, lines 11-26; column 6, lines 33-42)

Brooke fails to disclose the project data describing an electronic system design for

implementation on a programmable electronic device. Bauwens discloses the project

data describing an electronic system design for implementation on a programmable

electronic device (column 4, lines 11-22: Here, the integrated circuit is an electronic

system design, and the details about the inputs and outputs are the implementation of

that system). Dole discloses an integrated design environment (column 2, line 46-

column 3, line 10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

applicant's invention to have combined Brooke and Bauwen's method with Dole's

method, since it would have allowed a user to specify customized data structures for

dealing with the system design (Brooke: column 6, lines 18-21).

As per dependent claim 2, Brooke, Bauwens, and Dole disclose the limitations

similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Brooke further

discloses the method further including formatting the data sheet in HTML (column 8,

lines 7-17: Here, the XSP processor and XSP script act upon the XML tree to format the

datasheet into an HTML file).

As per dependent claim 3, Brooke, Bauwens, and Dole disclose the limitations

similar to those in claim 2, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Brooke further

discloses the method further including rendering the project datasheet as a visual output

datasheet using a browser (column 8, lines 9-15; column 5, lines 60-62).

As per dependent claim 4, Brooke, Bauwens, and Dole disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Brooke further discloses the method further including displaying said project datasheet (column 5, lines 57-62).

As per dependent claim 5, Brooke, Bauwens, and Dole disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 4, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Brooke further discloses the method wherein displaying the project datasheet is done as a single action display (column 5, lines 60-62; column 4, lines 58-62).

As per dependent claim 6, Brooke, Bauwens, and Dole disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 4, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Brooke further discloses the method wherein displaying the project datasheet includes printing the project datasheet (column 4, lines 58-62: Here, the fact that the system is equipped with a printer allows for the data sheet to be printed if the user desires).

As per dependent claim 7, Brooke, Bauwens, and Dole disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 4, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Bauwens further discloses the method integrated circuit pinout assignment data (column 4, lines 11-22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Brooke and Bauwens' method of displaying a project datasheet with Bauwens' method of including integrated circuit pinout data, since it would have allowed a user to view pinout data in a formatted display (Brooke: column 6, lines 35-38).

As per dependent claim 10, Brooke, Bauwens, and Dole disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 4, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Bauwens further discloses the method including input and output configuration data (column 4, lines 11-22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Brooke and Bauwens' method of displaying a project datasheet with Bauwens' method of including input and output configuration data, since it would have allowed a user to view input and output configuration data in a formatted display (Brooke: column 6, lines 35-38).

As per independent claim 11, the applicant recites similar limitations as claim 1, and is similarly rejected under Brooke, Bauwens, and Dole.

As per dependent claim 12, Brooke, Bauwens, and Dole disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 11, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant recites similar limitations as claim 2, and is similarly rejected under Brooke and Bauwens.

As per dependent claim 13, Brooke, Bauwens, and Dole disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 11, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant recites similar limitations as claim 3, and is similarly rejected under Brooke and Bauwens.

As per dependent claim 14, Brooke and, Bauwens, and Dole disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 11, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

The applicant recites similar limitations as claim 4, and is similarly rejected under Brooke and Bauwens.

As per dependent claim 15, Brooke, Bauwens, and Dole disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 11, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant recites similar limitations as claim 6, and is similarly rejected under Brooke and Bauwens.

As per dependent claim 16, Brooke, Bauwens, and Dole disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 11, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant recites similar limitations as claim 7, and is similarly rejected under Brooke and Bauwens.

As per independent claim 17, the applicant recites similar limitations as claim 1, and is similarly rejected under Brooke, Bauwens, and Dole.

As per dependent claim 18, Brooke, Bauwens, and Dole disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 17, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant recites similar limitations as claim 2, and is similarly rejected under Brooke and Bauwens.

As per dependent claim 19, Brooke, Bauwens, and Dole disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 18, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant recites similar limitations as claim 3, and is similarly rejected under Brooke and Bauwens.

As per dependent claim 20, Brooke, Bauwens, and Dole disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 17, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The

applicant recites similar limitations as claim 4, and is similarly rejected under Brooke and Bauwens.

As per dependent claim 21, Brooke, Bauwens, and Dole disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 17, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant recites similar limitations as claim 5, and is similarly rejected under Brooke and Bauwens.

As per dependent claim 22, Brooke, Bauwens, and Dole disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 17, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant recites similar limitations as claim 6, and is similarly rejected under Brooke and Bauwens.

As per dependent claim 23, Brooke, Bauwens, and Dole disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 17, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant recites similar limitations as claim 7, and is similarly rejected under Brooke and Bauwens.

5.   Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brooke, Bauwens, and Dole in further view of Gristede et al. (US 6175949, 2001).

As per dependent claim 8, Brooke, Bauwens, and Dole disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Brooke and Bauwens fail to disclose including a user module schematic. However, Gristede discloses a user module schematic (Figures 3-8: These figures are user module schematics).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Brooke, Bauwens, and Dole's method of displaying a project datasheet with Gristede's method of including a user module schematic, since it would have allowed the user to view a pictographic representation of the data.

As per dependent claim 9, Brooke, Bauwens, and Dole disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Brooke and Bauwens fail to disclose including global parameters. However, Gristede discloses global parameters (column 11, lines 23-32).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Brooke, Bauwens, and Dole's method of displaying project datasheet with Gristede's method of including global parameters, since it would have allowed a user to see not only a list of parameters used, but also the effects of the parameters on the parameters.

6.   Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauwens, Dole, and Gristede in further view of Object Domain R3 (March 2001) and XMI (2000).

As per independent claim 24, Gristede and Bauwens disclose the computer control method for generating design information comprising:

• A plurality of global parameters (Gristede column 11, lines 23-32)

• A plurality of programmable hardware resources (Gristede column 3, lines 48-53)

- At least one user module representing a circuit design (Bauwens column 4, lines 11-22)

- An integrate design environment (Dole: column 2, line 46- column 3, line 10)

Bauwens and Gristede fail to disclose:

- Parameterizing the user module

- Establishing connections to the user module

- Automatically generating a datasheet file describing an electronic design project comprising the user module as paramterized, its connections and said global parameters

XMI discloses:

- Parameterizing the user module (section 1.2.1.2: Here, the document is mapped to the correct interface)

Object Domain R3 discloses:

- Establishing connections to the user module (page 1: Here, by generating the XMI document, Object Domain connects to the original model document to create the dataheet file)

- Automatically generating a datasheet file describing an electronic design project comprising the user module as paramterized, its connections and said global parameters (page 1: Here, Object Domain generates an XMI file)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Bauwens, Dole, Gristede's method of modeling circuit design with XMI and Object Domain's method of parameterizing a module and

generating a datasheet file, since it would have allowed a user to generate an XML compliant file to describe his/her module (XMI: section 1.3).

7.   Claims 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauwens, Dole, Gristede, Object Domain R3, and XMI in further view of Brooke.

As per dependent claim 25, Bauwens, Dole, Gristede, Object Domain R3, and XMI disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 24, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant recites similar limitations as claim 3, and is similarly rejected under Brooke and Bauwens.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Bauwens, Dole, Gristede, Object Domain R3, and XMI's method with Brooke's method, since it would have allowed a user to view a datasheet.

As per dependent claim 26, Bauwens, Dole, Gristede, Object Domain R3, and XMI disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 24, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant recites similar limitations as claim 1, and is similarly rejected under Brooke and Bauwens.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Bauwens, Dole, Gristede, Object Domain R3, and XMI's method with Brooke's method, since it would have allowed a user process XSL stylesheets within in integrated design environment.

Response to Arguments

8.　　Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-26 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

As detailed above, the Dole reference has been added to address the applicant's

arguments.

Conclusion

9.　　Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Kyle R Stork whose telephone number is (571) 272-

4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (7:00-3:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (703) 308-5465. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kyle Stork
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178

KRS

CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER